

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 stand rejected. Claims 1-20 remain pending in this patent application. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below.

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments to the specification and claims do not add new matter to the application.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Applicant understands that Claims 1, 7, 8, 10, 13, 14, 16 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janky et al., US Patent Number 6,496,874 (hereinafter Janky) in view of Gaston et al., US Patent Number 6,546,297 (hereinafter Gaston). Additionally, Applicant understands that Claims 2-4, 9 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janky in view of Gaston as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of applicant's admitted prior art. Furthermore, Applicant understands that Claims 5, 6, 11, 12, 17, 18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Janky in view of Gaston as applied to Claim 1, and further in view of Sorek et al., Publication Number US 2001/0034803.

CLAIM 1

Applicant respectfully contends that the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a method of expanding capabilities of a

palmtop computer with a memory expansion module as recited in newly amended independent Claim 1. For instance, amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

coupling a sled device to the palmtop computer, so that the sled device is coupled directly to the memory expansion module and to a communication port of the palmtop computer.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a sled device coupled directly to a memory expansion module and communication port of a palmtop computer as specifically recited in amended Claim 1.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully contends that the standard hardware control module(s) 115 of the Gaston reference is not analogous to the memory expansion module of the palmtop computer as recited in amended Claim 1. For example, the standard hardware control module(s) 115 includes a processor 145 and “is connected to control active components 130 of a device 120.” See Figure 1 and column 4, lines 54-58. As such, Applicant respectfully contends that the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a sled device coupled directly to a memory expansion module and communication port of a palmtop computer as specifically recited in amended Claim 1. Since the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest one or more elements recited within

amended Claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Janky and Gaston references do not render obvious amended Claim 1.

Based on the above rationale, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 1 is not rendered obvious by the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits amended Claim 1 is allowable over the Janky and Gaston references.

#### CLAIM 7

Applicant respectfully contends that the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a palmtop computer having enhanced expansion as recited in newly amended independent Claim 7. For instance, amended Claim 7 recites in part (emphasis added):

a connector, operatively coupled to the communication interface and to the expansion memory, to permit an external device to communicate with the central processor via the communication interface and to permit the external device to directly access the expansion memory.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a connector of a palmtop computer that permits an external device to directly access the expansion memory of the palmtop computer as recited in amended Claim 7.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully contends that the standard hardware control module(s) 115 of the Gaston reference is not analogous to the expansion memory of the palmtop computer as recited in amended Claim 7. For example, the standard hardware control module(s) 115 includes a processor 145 and "is connected to control active components 130 of a device 120." See Figure 1 and column 4, lines 54-58. Additionally, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Gaston reference does not teach or suggest direct memory access to the standard hardware control module(s) 115.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully contends that the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a connector of a palmtop computer that permits an external device to directly access the expansion memory of the palmtop computer as recited in amended Claim 7. Since the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest one or more elements recited within amended Claim 7, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Janky and Gaston references do not render obvious amended Claim 7.

Based on the above rationale, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 7 is not rendered obvious by the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits amended Claim 7 is allowable over the Janky and Gaston references.

CLAIM 14

Applicant respectfully asserts that the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest an expansion device for a palmtop computer as recited in newly amended independent Claim 14. For instance, amended Claim 14 recites in part (emphasis added):

a memory interface connected to the expansion device-side connector  
for directly accessing the expansion memory of the palmtop computer.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest a memory interface of an expansion device for a palmtop computer that is connected to an expansion device-side connector for directly accessing the expansion memory of the palmtop computer as recited in amended Claim 14.

Specifically, Applicant respectfully contends that the standard hardware control module(s) 115 of the Gaston reference is not analogous to the expansion memory of the palmtop computer as recited in amended Claim 14. For example, the standard hardware control module(s) 115 includes a processor 145 and "is connected to control active components 130 of a device 120." See Figure 1 and column 4, lines 54-58. Additionally, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Gaston reference does not teach or suggest direct memory access to the standard hardware control module(s) 115.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully contends that the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest a memory interface of an expansion device for a palmtop computer that is connected to an expansion device-side connector for directly accessing the expansion memory of the palmtop computer as recited in amended Claim 14. Since the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest one or more elements recited within amended Claim 14, Applicant respectfully asserts that the Janky and Gaston references do not render obvious amended Claim 14.

Based on the above rationale, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claim 14 is not rendered obvious by the Janky and Gaston references, alone or in combination. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits amended Claim 14 is allowable over the Janky and Gaston references.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of rejected Claims 1-20.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



Dated: SEPT 2, 2003

Thomas M. Catale  
Registration No.: 46,434

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP  
Two North Market Street, Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113

Voice: (408) 938-9060  
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069